UNITED
NATIONS

CCPR

International covenant
on civil and
political rights

Distr.
GENERAL

CCPR/C/SR.1959
19 October 2001

Original: ENGLISH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Seventy-third session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIRST PART (PUBLIC)* OF THE 1959th MEETING

Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 16 October 2001, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. BHAGWATI

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 40 OF THE COVENANT (continued)

Fifth periodic report of Ukraine (continued)

* The summary record of the second part (closed) of the meeting appears as document CCPR/C/SR.1959/Add.1.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.01-45203 (E) 181001 191001

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 40 OF THE COVENANT (agenda item 5) (continued)

Fifth periodic report of Ukraine (CCPR/C/UKR/99/5; CCPR/C/73/L/UKR) (continued)

1. Mr. ANDO said he shared his colleagues' concern that Ukraine's report, while supplying exhaustive details of the legal provisions designed to protect and promote human rights, contained comparatively few data on the current status of their implementation. In connection with the right to freedom of expression under article 19 of the Covenant, he asked what percentage of the electronic media in Ukraine were in private hands, what percentage of the management expenses for press agencies in Ukraine were subsidized regularly by the Government, and whether the delegation could provide any information on the causes of any cases of bankruptcy, tax avoidance or other financial irregularities which had involved the press agencies. Finally, since radio and television stations did not, according to the report, have the right to disclose facts constituting State secrets or other secrets protected by legislation, he would like the delegation to provide facts about any specific violations which had occurred. Who had raised the issue, what procedures and outcomes had resulted, and had the judicial authorities been involved?

2. Ms. MEDINA QUIROGA said she still did not feel that the delegation had provided precise answers to the Committee's earlier questions regarding exceptions to the rule requiring that a defence lawyer be present during initial questioning, and about the deadline for submission to the procurator of written material requesting extension of initial custody. She would also like the delegation to provide clarifications about the independence of the Ukrainian judiciary and the problem of achieving efficiency in court hearings, in the light of the report's assertions that most appeal and supervisory court verdicts were set aside because of the absence of the elements of a crime in the actions of the convicted person, and that in most cases citizens were wrongly convicted because of incorrect and often one-sided investigation of the facts.

3. The delegation had also yet to reply to her questions concerning women, the status of the Covenant in Ukrainian legislation, and the extent to which the freedoms of thought and religious opinion were restricted during a state of emergency. With regard to freedom of expression, she associated herself with the questions put by Mr. Kretzmer, but would like to know whether, under the Ukrainian system, it was a case of the authorities having their honour and dignity protected by criminal legislation, or whether respect for the authorities was implicit under the concept of offences against public order. Finally, she was puzzled by the report's assertion that the law could not be applied to "neo-religions" without certain infringements of the principles of freedom of religion, assembly and association. What were those infringements, and how did they prevent the destructive influence of such religious communities on individuals?

4. Sir Nigel RODLEY asked for more information on the phases of arrest and detention. After what length of time must a request be made to the procurator to extend a period of police detention, for how long could the procurator authorize such an extension without further authorization from a judge, what was the nature of the exception to such a judicial extension mentioned earlier by the delegation, and was the prisoner required to be present when the court

authorized an extension? Also, although the delegation had made it clear that remand centres and prisons for convicted persons came under the authority of the Prisons Department, he would like to know if the latter was fully independent of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and if persons arrested by the Ministry remained under its jurisdiction until trial and conviction. If not, at what point were they removed from its jurisdiction?

5. He welcomed the information that allegations of mistreatment in prison made in court could be referred straight to the procurator so that an immediate decision could be taken on admissibility. However, it had not been made clear where the burden of proof lay in such a situation. Ideally, the burden should lie with the State, since it was frequently impossible for the detainee to discharge the obligation to prove maltreatment on the part of the prison authorities. He would like to know more about the enforcement of article 46 (1) of the Code of Penal Procedure, under which the presence of a defence lawyer could be denied during initial interrogation. He asked the delegation to comment on the many alleged instances of such denial of access, often accompanied by maltreatment, which had been reported to the Committee by NGOs, and to indicate whether such cases had arisen through application of the article in question or through straightforward failure to apply the law. In the event of the latter, he would like to know what measures were in place to ensure that an individual was granted access to a lawyer in accordance with his constitutional and legal rights.

6. The CHAIRPERSON said the report appeared to indicate that persons employed in State enterprises, educational establishments and other State institutions and organizations were barred from membership of political parties. Was that the case?

7. Mr. PASENIUK (Ukraine), in reply to the questions put by Sir Nigel Rodley, said that the prison system had now been separated completely from the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Accordingly, an arrested person was no longer confronted initially by the police, who were now only granted permission to conduct further investigations at the second stage. Under new legislation a lawyer must be involved in criminal proceedings from the moment of the suspect's arrest, and then had the right to be present at all stages of the proceedings being conducted by the procurator, the police or security bodies. In principle, individuals in financial need were entitled to a lawyer paid out of public funds, although, owing to Ukraine's financial situation, the amount of support was often limited. Persons who wished to mount their own defence were automatically assigned a public lawyer, and all accused persons suffering from a mental or physical disability were entitled to a defence paid out of the public purse.

8. Ms. KARPACHOVA (Ukraine) said that in 1999, the latest year for which figures were available, the State had provided pro bono advocacy for 6,000 individuals at the pre-trial stage of criminal cases, and for a further 7,000 at the trial stage. Although the Code of Penal Procedure and the relevant legislation clearly provided that the individual must be present during trial, it had been made clear by the Ombudsman and other agencies that in Ukraine, as in other countries where judicial reform had recently occurred, some judges continued to act in breach of the arrest and trial procedures.

9. The delegation was still not in a position to reply to the many questions on women put by Mr. Amor, Mr. Yalden and Ms. Medina Quiroga. However, she could supply some salient facts. First, Ukraine had ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination

against Women in 1998 when still a part of the Soviet Union. In 1995, the Ukrainian parliament had devoted special hearings to Ukraine's commitments under the Convention. That had led to a radical change in perceptions of women working in government, although patriarchal attitudes still persisted. Nevertheless, whereas the women who had accounted for 30 per cent of all Soviet parliamentary deputies had been dominated by their male colleagues in every respect, it could now be fairly said that the women who accounted for 8 per cent of Ukraine's deputies had been freely elected and were not subject to male oppression. Ukraine had one woman cabinet minister and one woman diplomat, 2 out of 18 judges in the Constitutional Court were women, as were 9 of the 68 judges in the Supreme Court. There were no women at the highest levels of the Procurator's Office, but five had reached the rank of deputy regional procurator. Nineteen women worked as procurators in the regions, and women accounted for 38 per cent of judges in regional and municipal courts. In 1991, women had filled 14 per cent of high-level posts in governmental service, whereas in 2001 they accounted for 23 per cent.

10. Over 70 per cent of the unemployed were women. Despite ILO assistance in rural areas, there were almost no female managers working in the vitally important agricultural sector. The Second Congress of Women in Agriculture was currently taking place and, with the support of the President and regional governors, there was considerable optimism that by the March 2002 elections a more equitable gender balance could be achieved at decision-making levels in the agricultural sector.

11. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukraine), in reply to a question put by Sir Nigel Rodley, said that Ukraine would not apply the death penalty in time of war, having refused to exercise its right to express a reservation to Protocol No. 6 to the European Convention on Human Rights that would allow it to do so. In reply to a question by Mr. Henkin, he said that under article 7 of Ukraine's Law on Citizenship, a person born in Ukraine, one of whose parents was a non-citizen who had been granted asylum, automatically acquired Ukrainian citizenship.

12. Mr. SKURATOVSKI (Ukraine), in reply to questions by Mr. Kretzmer, said that, with regard to the Gongadzhe case, neither the procurator's Office nor the other organizations with a legitimate interest had been able to establish that the Ukrainian authorities had been involved in the disappearance of the individual concerned. The Procurator's Office, the security forces and the Ministry of Internal Affairs were actively developing protective measures for journalists. All information received in relation to threats against journalists was investigated immediately by the law enforcement bodies.

13. The Leshkov case had been dismissed and no libel suit had been considered by the courts. The individual concerned was able to pursue his professional activities unhindered.

14. With regard to reports that students had been forced to take part in regional elections and referendums, he said that a full investigation had proved the allegations to be unfounded. Licences to operate television and radio stations were the responsibility of a national body comprising representatives of the President and the Supreme Council.

15. In reply to a question by Ms. Medina Quiroga, he said that a procurator was obliged to act immediately in granting an extension of detention. Concerning her comments on the

independence of the judiciary, he said that, under new legislation already adopted and reforms currently under preparation, both judges and procurators were granted full freedom of autonomous operation.

16. Mr. ZADVORNYI (Ukraine) said that a number of questions had been asked about religious freedom and the registration of religious organizations. Ethnic minorities enjoyed the same rights as other citizens in regard to religion. No one could be prosecuted on religious grounds and no such prosecutions had been carried out. Various categories of Jewish religious organizations had been registered. Article 24 of the Constitution concerning the equality of all citizens before the law was fully observed and no one was entitled to privileges on the basis of religion. Religion and religious organizations were generally accepted concepts defined by legislation. Currently, about 100 religious organizations or associations were registered with the Government and a list could be provided if additional information was required. On the question of non-traditional faiths or religious organizations, he noted that there had recently been an upsurge of non-traditional and innovative religious movements among the population of Ukraine. Mainly neo-Christian movements, not typical of Ukrainians in general or of the national minorities, had only been encountered in the last 10 years. In the year 2000, there had been 1,083 such organizations, 26 of them having fewer than 1,000 members. The new religious associations tended to be concentrated in the eastern and southern parts of the country. There were 490 of what might be termed charismatic communities among them. Registration of a religious association could only be prohibited if any part of its statute was incompatible with the law. Ms. Medina Quiroga had asked a question about the activities of certain non-traditional organizations believed to have a negative influence on the minds of their followers. Measures had been taken under the law in force against one such association, the "Great White Brotherhood".

17. Mr. DUMCHENKO said, in response to a question from the Chairperson, that the establishment of political parties was prohibited when the party's structures extended beyond the borders of Ukraine. The establishment of political parties in branches of government and in the armed forces and similar bodies was also prohibited. The position of Ukraine was that the judiciary and the executive should not be politicized.

18. Ms. KARPACHOVA said, in response to several questions about freedom of speech and the functioning of the electronic media in Ukraine, that more than 800 electronic media were currently registered. Largely, owing to the economic crisis, regular newspaper readership was very low by international standards. That only 62 out of every 1,000 persons subscribed to a newspaper or periodical was recognized as constituting a serious problem. Among the mass media many organs had already been privatized and the percentage increased each month. Accordingly, financial support from the Government was also dwindling, making it difficult to say precisely how much was being spent on subsidizing the press. There was still a State newspaper and efforts were being made to keep financing for the State radio and television services at the current level. Two trends seemed to be emerging in regard to freedom of speech and the right to information. Given the difficult market conditions and the fierce competition among commercial owners, it was hard to ensure that alternative media were available. At the same time, the extreme freedom of journalists to write how and on what they pleased caused other, sometimes ethical, problems. She pointed out that her second report contained a special section on freedom of speech.

19. On the Gongadzhe case and the way in which the authorities had reacted, she said that she had recently attended a hearing at which the rights of the mother and other relatives had been recognized by the court. Under an article of the Penal Code, it had for a long time not been possible to recognize the mother and relatives of a person who had disappeared as being entitled to compensation. The organization "Reporters without borders" had already addressed the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on the matter and another expert assessment was expected to be carried out as a follow-up to the Ukrainian examination of the case.

20. Mr. Yalden had asked how the Ombudsman's Office was able to deal with the very large number of petitions received. The Office did not, of course, possess enough qualified staff of its own. It accordingly called on the assistance of outside legal experts already experienced in human rights matters in an effort to ensure that every citizen who made a complaint received a reply. A system had been set up whereby the human rights involved in the complaints were classified. Based on the principle of non-discrimination, the list categorized the rights concerned as personal, political, civil, economic, social or cultural. There was then a further classification in terms of the characteristics of the individual making the complaint: child, woman, member of the armed forces etc. Of the total numbers of complaints received, 56 per cent concerned civil rights, 20 per cent economic rights, 16 per cent social rights, 5 per cent personal rights, 2-3 per cent political rights and 1 per cent cultural rights.

21. She was proud to say that, on the advice of the Ombudsman's Office based on the direct petitions it had received, the Constitutional Court had decided to abolish the discriminatory age rule governing the recovery of payments to savings banks in the former Soviet Union. Some 11,000 citizens would now be able to recover their savings from those banks. A precise mechanism would need to be worked out.

22. Ms. YAVLOVYTSKA (Ukraine) said, in reply to a question from Mr. Amor, that the formation of political parties was governed by rules that made it obligatory to obtain official recognition. Any political organization or association that failed to be registered was illegal. On registration, such citizens' associations received the status of a corporate body. Registration was with the Ministry of Justice and the law provided that it could be refused if the documents submitted failed to comply with the Constitution or other legislation. If registration was refused, a written decision must be handed down. The refusal could be appealed to a court and was not an obstacle to re-application.

23. Ms. KARPACHOVA (Ukraine) said that four members of the Committee had asked related questions about torture and other degrading treatment. Ill-treatment of accused persons was recognized as being a problem in Ukraine and the new Penal Code made such violations of human rights punishable. A new article of the Code had established criminal liability for torture, which carried penalties ranging from 3 to 5 years' imprisonment and, in the case of torture by a law enforcement officer, 5 to 10 years. Prospects were good for the prevention of torture in future. In the year 2000, 285 police officers had been charged with the offence of torture and there had been 69 cases of excessive use of force. Nearly all those cases had been brought to court.

24. In response to questions about conditions for women detainees, she said that they had formerly been largely the same as those for men. The new Prisons Department, however, had

made a start on dealing with a number of issues. In August 2001, some 15,000 women held separately from men but in equally poor conditions had been moved to an excellent new detention centre offering special facilities for women. On the question of solitary confinement, she said that in 1999, out of a total of 218,000 prisoners 3,015 had been held in isolation cells. Among them many had died of tuberculosis. In 1999, there had been 45 cases of suicide in solitary confinement and in the year 2000, 31.

25. The Council of Europe had urged Ukraine to establish a special prisons department under the Ministry of Justice. Ukraine had taken its own path, however, and had chosen to create a new independent department whose activities were directly coordinated by the Prime Minister. The structural changes made and the new staff appointed offered new and positive prospects for the country's prison system.

26. Mr. PASENIUK (Ukraine) noted that there had been a sharp decline in the suicide rate in recent years. By the year 2000, the rate had been halved as a result of the establishment of a psychological unit offering assistance in dealing with the negative effects of detention on the psyche.

27. Mr. KRETZMER thanked the members of the delegation for their efforts to respond to the Committee's questions. Nevertheless, he still felt that some of his questions had been left unanswered and that in other cases the reply had been very general and failed to address the specific point raised. He had asked about an incident said to have occurred in April 2001 when members of Ukrainian Amnesty International had been summoned by the local police for interrogation and wanted to know whether there had been any other instances of intimidation of human rights workers. He had also asked whether the delegation could officially confirm that libel had been decriminalized.

28. The reply given to his question about the editor Mr. Leshkov had been very general. According to the Committee's information, he had been sentenced by a court on 7 June 2001 and banned from practising as a journalist for two years. Had that sentence now been quashed and had there been any similar cases since then?

29. In regard to control of the electronic media, the Committee had been told that a new council had been established consisting of representatives of the President and other persons; it was therefore clearly controlled by the executive branch. Some 800 licences were said to have been granted, but the Committee had not been told how many had been refused and on what grounds. As far as State subsidization of the media was concerned, he appreciated that the transfer from a command economy to privatization made it difficult to calculate the amount. He had asked, however, what criteria were used to decide whether or not a newspaper should be subsidized. He understood that in one case a subsidy had been withdrawn because a newspaper had made anti-Semitic pronouncements. He had asked whether subsidies could also be withdrawn on the grounds of comments critical of the Government.

30. Lastly, he had asked about the alleged intimidation of students in the course of the April 2000 referendum. The Committee had been told that that incident had not been confirmed. There had also been allegations of the dismissal of government employees. Had any similar investigation been carried out into those allegations?

31. Ms. MEDINA QUIROGA said that she had asked specifically what was the deadline for the person responsible for preparing a report on each case of detention, since the period within which the procurator must give his authorization for remand in custody or release would start at that point. There had also been no reply to her question about the statement in paragraph 470 of the report that the application of the law to neo-religions was impossible without certain infringements of the principles of freedom of religion. What was the offence which caused such measures to be taken? She had also asked whether there was still criminal liability for libel and whether there was any difference between ordinary libel and libel of public authorities. What constituted a criminal offence in that respect?

32. Mr. SOLARI YRIGOYEN said that he was disappointed that neither of the two issues he had raised had been addressed. In the case of the restrictions on conscientious objection, he had not been told the length of the alternative period of civilian service. He had also referred to the brutal treatment of conscripts denounced by many human rights bodies. With regard to anti-Semitic activities, he would like to know what compensatory measures had been taken, or were to be taken, in connection with the Jewish cemeteries destroyed by the Nazis in Kiev in 1942.

33. Mr. PASENIUK (Ukraine) confirmed that Mr. Leshkov had been sentenced on 7 June 2001. A new Penal Code under which certain acts were decriminalized had taken effect on 1 September and proceedings had ceased in all cases involving such acts. Mr. Leshkov had thus been acquitted. Moreover, he had not been banned from working as a journalist but only from carrying out managerial duties. The paragraph mentioned by Ms. Medina Quiroga referred to the old legislation. Since June 2001, authorization for remand or release was issued by the court and must be made known within 72 hours.

34. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukraine) said that there had been many changes both in life and in legislation in Ukraine in the two years since the report had been submitted and the delegation had been eager to provide additional information. In answer to Mr. Solari Yrigoyen, he said that to benefit from an alternative to military service, the applicant must meet three conditions: he must belong to a religious organization, he must possess genuine religious convictions, and the teaching of the organization must not allow the use of weapons in the armed forces. Under the new law, the period of alternative service was two years. On the question of the destruction of Jewish cemeteries, he noted that in 1942 Ukraine had been under Nazi occupation and that there had been no Ukrainian authorities at that time, and so no claim could be made.

35. Mr. PASENIUK (Ukraine) said that if any member of the Committee had not received a full reply to any question, the delegation would undertake to provide the information in writing immediately on return to Ukraine.

36. The CHAIRPERSON, concluding the dialogue between the Committee and the delegation, expressed appreciation for the report, which was comprehensive and had been submitted punctually. While it provided a wealth of detail on constitutional and legal provisions, regrettably information on what was actually happening on the ground was inadequate. That defect had been remedied to some extent by the answers given by the delegation in the course of the dialogue, but some questions remained unanswered.

37. Ukraine had made considerable progress since the submission of its previous report. In the course of the past five years a new Constitution, incorporating an extensive bill of rights, had been promulgated, and the institution of Ombudsman had been established, with wide powers to investigate human rights abuses. A new Constitutional Court had been set up and many new laws safeguarding human rights enacted. The Committee had been glad to note that the death penalty had been abolished and that libel had been decriminalized.

38. As far as the status of the Covenant in the legal hierarchy was concerned, the position did not appear to be satisfactory. Although under article 9 of the Constitution the Covenant had been made part of domestic law, it had not been given higher status to ensure that it would prevail in case of conflict. He welcomed Ms. Karpachova's efforts to have that article amended, and hoped that in time they would prove successful. The concept of national minorities and its relation to the concept of citizenship needed clarification. Although the Constitution proclaimed equality between men and women, in practice only 8 per cent of members of parliament were women, and there were few women in senior positions in both the public and private sectors.

39. The suspension, during a state of emergency, of the right to freedom of thought and religion enshrined in the Constitution was incompatible with article 4 of the Covenant, and he hoped that steps would be taken to remedy that situation. He commended the delegation's frankness in admitting that the practice of torture by law enforcement officers constituted a problem, and that the extension of pre-trial detention from 72 hours to 10 days contravened the Constitution as well as the Covenant. Exemption from military service only on religious grounds and not on grounds of conscientious objection appeared to violate article 18 of the Covenant. In addition, the situation whereby only traditional faiths could be professed, as indicated in paragraph 380 of the report, would seem to violate article 14.

40. The fact that members of the council for the grant of licences to the media were appointed either by the President or by the Legislative Council gave cause for concern. In the light of the importance of the media in modern society, the granting of licences should be entrusted to an independent body. Manifestations of anti-Semitism, which constituted a gross violation of human rights, should be eradicated. The situation whereby members of State enterprises and educational institutions were not permitted to take part in political activities should be remedied. Those issues, as well as others raised by members of the Committee, would be included in the Committee's concluding observations and recommendations, which would be transmitted to the delegation at the end of the session.

41. In conclusion, he wished the Ukraine all success in its democratic experiment.

42. Mr. PASENIUK (Ukraine) expressed appreciation for the professionalism and expertise shown by members of the Committee in the questions they had put to his delegation. He was pleased to note that consideration of the report had taken the form of a dialogue and had been conducted in a spirit of mutual respect. He assured the Committee that all comments made would be taken into account when Ukraine's next periodic report came to be prepared.

43. The Ukrainian delegation withdrew.

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5.05 p.m.

44. Mr. SCHMIDT (Secretary of the Committee) said a supplement to the second periodic report of Switzerland (CCPR/C/CH/98/2), which was to be considered on Friday, 19 October, had just been circulated. It reproduced the report submitted in September 1998, with the paragraphs that reflected developments in the intervening three years and were relevant to the Committee highlighted in bold type and in italics. He had received information from the Swiss Permanent Mission that it was currently in the process of finalizing its written replies to questions on the list of issues. Copies of those replies would be made available to the Committee on Friday morning. Both the supplement and the replies were in French only.

45. Mr. YALDEN said that although the Committee did not wish to be too rigid in its procedures, there were limits. The United Kingdom's responses to questions on the list of issues relating to its report (CCPR/C/UK/99/5) had been received only the previous afternoon, and that day a document of 100 pages had been circulated as a supplement to the report of Switzerland. A further document of 82 pages referring to the latter report was to be made available only on the day scheduled for consideration of the report. Those late submissions would cause serious problems.

46. Mr. SCHMIDT (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the second periodic report of Switzerland had been submitted in September 1998, and since then there had been a number of developments relevant to the consideration of civil and political rights in Switzerland. The Swiss Government would not be willing to contemplate postponement of consideration of its report.

47. Mr. ANDO said he did not think the Committee should miss the opportunity of considering Switzerland's report on the date scheduled. The delegation could provide any additional information orally, and that would be interpreted.

48. Mr. SCHEININ said the situation was very unfortunate. The Chairperson should make clear to the delegation that only the original report, which had been translated into the working languages, would be subject to formal consideration. He should also make clear that the State party had not complied with the Committee's guidelines concerning the time-frame for the submission of additional information.

49. Ms. CHANET pointed out that the same considerations applied to the documents just received from the United Kingdom.

50. Mr. SOLARI YRIGOYEN noted that the United Kingdom report relating to overseas territories (CCPR/C/UK/OT/99/5) referred to more than 10 documents, only 2 of which had been distributed, although not translated. It was very difficult for the Committee to consider reports which made reference to documents not available to it. The Committee should ensure that in future it should not be asked to take into consideration lengthy documents submitted at the last minute in one working language only.

51. Ms. MEDINA QUIROGA considered that the Committee should take a stand on the issue as a matter of principle. Non-compliance with the guidelines for submission of documents placed the Committee in a very difficult position, since it put certain members at a disadvantage.

52. Mr. AMOR agreed that the non-availability of documents in working languages posed a problem, but pointed out that the United Kingdom had after all submitted its 1998 report on time; it was not its fault if that report had been overtaken by events.

53. Sir Nigel RODLEY said that, as he saw it, there was no real disagreement on the issue. Clearly, delegations must be told that documents submitted too late to be translated could not be treated as documents for discussion, and that their statements should reflect that fact. The Committee should not assume bad faith on the part of Governments: not all of them would necessarily be fully informed as to the Committee's guidelines, and care should be taken not to discourage them from trying to be cooperative. The fact remained that, had it not been for problems of late submission and translation, the Committee would have been able to advance its knowledge of the situation before the dialogue started and then to ask any supplementary questions immediately. It was important that the Committee should express regret at not being in a position to take advantage of the submissions made and should explain the reasons for that situation.

54. Mr. KRETZMER supported that view. In fact, the submissions had been intended to save the Committee time by avoiding the need for delegations to explain the latest developments orally. The Committee should not ignore the documents and should not be unduly critical of the delegations concerned, since otherwise they might be tempted to take the easy way out and to defer presentation of such material until the day of the meeting.

55. The CHAIRPERSON said the best that could be done in the circumstances was to tell the delegations that, since the information had arrived late, it had not been possible to take it into account in advance. It could, however, be presented orally.

56. Mr. KRETZMER pointed out that the Committee had frequently asked delegations during the consideration of reports to provide additional information and had been pleased to receive lengthy single-language supplements after the session.

57. The CHAIRPERSON said he took it that the Committee wished to act on Sir Nigel Rodley's suggestion.

58. It was so decided.

59. Mr. de ZAYAS (Secretariat) suggested including an additional paragraph in the standard note verbale addressed to States parties whose reports fell due, saying that any addendum to the report or written answers to the list of issues should be submitted at least 10 weeks prior to the Committee's session to allow time for translation into the working languages.

The public part of the meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.